10A

RELIGIOUS TRACTS.—No. 292.

Published by the "Episcopal Female Tract Society of Philadelphia," for the "Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church for the Advancement of Christianity in Pennsylvania."

TWO OF EIGHT LETTERS

TO

N. WISEMAN, D.D.,

ON THE

ERRORS OF ROMANISM,

IN RESPECT TO

WORSHIP OF SAINTS, SATISFACTIONS, PURGATORY, INDULGENCES, AND THE WORSHIP OF IMAGES AND RELICS.

1803 - 1885

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM PALMER, M.A.,

OF WORCESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD.

PHILADELPHIA:

KING & BAIRD, PRINTERS, No. 9 SANSOM STREET.

1851.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

https://archive.org/details/twoofeightletter00palm

PREFACE.

THE publication of these Letters was undertaken with a view to exhibit some of the most important features of Romanism in their genuine form. This task has become necessary in consequence of the system of Reserve so generally practised by Romish controversialists, in reference to the more obnoxious parts of their system.

The system referred to, studiously distinguishes the doctrines and practices prevalent in the Roman Communion into two classes; the former consisting of matters of faith, or doctrines defined by the Church; the latter consisting of matters of opinion, or doctrines not so defined. The use made of this distinction in all writings and discourses intended for those who are opposed to Romanism, is to avoid all responsibility for, and all discussion on, doctrines of the latter class, by representing them as mere non-essentials, which any member of the Roman Communion may dispute or reject at pleasure; while the attention of opponents is drawn entirely to the former class of doctrines, which being commonly proposed in general terms, and with great caution, are far less assailable.

The benefits derived from this system are various. In the first place, it induces some of those who are opposed to Romanism, to direct their attention almost entirely to the formal definitions of the Council of Trent, and to condemn some points which might be more discreetly

left untouched. The effect of this is to create division amongst opponents, and to place some of them in untenable positions. Secondly, all discussion is avoided on weak and vulnerable points, and there is no danger lest the popular mind should be disturbed by doubts on the propriety of its most favourite notions and practices. Thirdly, it smooths away any opposition which might arise from Romanists themselves, if these doctrines were pronounced essential; and facilitates their dissemination throughout the community. So that, in fine, the most highly objectionable tenets may be universally received amongst Romanists, and yet it may be positively denied that the Roman Catholic Church teaches those tenets. It has been a chief object in these Letters to detect and expose this system, which must be considered as more ingenious than honest.

LETTER II.

ON THE FOUNDATION OF THE ROMISH DOCTRINES OF SATISFACTIONS, INDULGENCES, PURGATORY, AND SUFFRAGES FOR THE DEAD.

SIR:

You have yourself commenced the present controversy, and can therefore have no reason to complain if I pursue the path which you have opened. You have afforded an opportunity for entering on a discussion and refutation of doctrines commonly and authoritatively taught in your Communion; an opportunity which seems to bear the impress of a Providential design, and of which I avail myself with the utmost joy, under the expectation that, amidst the excitement which evidently pervades the minds of Romanists in this country, and the spirit of enquiry which exists among them, and which cannot in all instances be repressed, the doctrines of Scripture, of Tradition, of the Roman Church herself (rightly understood,) may be heard amongst you—heard, it may be, with rage and opposition by some—but still heard, and felt to be unanswered—heard perhaps with docility by others, and made the means of their extrication from a mass of dangerous and pernicious error, if not of their own restoration to that way of salvation, the true Church of Christ, from which they are at present, under the mysterious will of God, severed.

In the name of Christian truth and sincerity, I hope that no measures may be taken by those who are in authority amongst Romanists, to check the spirit of discussion which has lately so much distinguished them. If Romanism be the truth, it will not shrink from an examination into its merits. If it be conscious of strength, it will courageously meet its opponents in the field of controversy. There will not be any attempt to *stifle* discussion and enquiry.

There cannot be any impropriety, any spirit of unprovoked aggression, in my comments on the errors and superstitions of your Church, when it is remembered, that the Press has, for years, been teeming with the controversial publications of Romanists, inviting attention to the pretended merits of their religion, and assailing those of the Catholic Church in England; when Societies are instituted with the avowed intention of perverting the faithful to your schism; when you are loud in

your boastings of the success of your system of proselytism; when you seem to "live, and move, and have your being," in assailing our Religion by every method, temporal as well as spiritual; and when no views, however moderate, however orthodox, however harmonizing with those of Catholic Antiquity, can protect their advocates from your interference, and from your controversial attacks. May it not be justly enquired, "Is there not a cause?" Is it not time to expose your sophistries, to hold up your contradictions to the world, and to drag your errors and superstitions forth into the face of day, and assail them with the weapons of Truth?

You have vainly imagined, that because the study of Catholic Antiquity has recently acquired a new importance—because men are no longer satisfied with superficial and popular systems of divinity, but view Scripture in its own light, reflected in the writings of the holy Martyrs and Saints of old; and because the primitive Church in all its parts has become the object of admiration and the model for imitation—(not always with strict judgment, I admit,) you have imagined, I say, that this movement was destined to promote your objects, and to bring converts to you. You have been buoying yourselves up with this hope, not without occasional misgivings that it might prove delusive in the end. You have indeed been *compelled* to assure your people, that men who studied Christian Antiquity, with a disposition to submit to its doctrines, could not fail to become Romanists; for had they been permitted to think any other result possible—had they been made aware that the study of Catholic Antiquity would only *rivet* men in their opposition to Romish errors, they might have been led to doubt whether those errors were really supported by Catholic tradition, as you pertinaciously and loudly assert them to be. But, Sir, time will dissipate these vain prognostics, these empty and baseless visions.

* * * * * *

I need scarcely point out to your sagacity, that a vast body of your doctrines and practices to which we object, depends altogether on one principle, which is as it were the foundation-stone, the very vital essence of the whole. I mean your doctrine of a debt still remaining due to Divine Justice after the remission of sin—the doctrine of *temporal punishments* to be endured for sin after its eternal penalty has been remitted. It is the doctrine of your Church, that by the Divine Law, temporal as well as eternal penalties are due to sin; that while the latter, together with the *guilt* of sin, are remitted in the Sacrament of

Penance, the former still remain due to Divine Justice; and that they may be averted by works of satisfaction, such as prayer, fasting, and alms-deeds, and by the suffrages of the Church, especially by the sacrifice of the holy Eucharist. Let me in order to make my meaning still clearer, extract from your own writings a very clear and accurate exposition of the doctrine in question—an exposition which is perfectly in accordance with the tenets of all your divines on this subject.

"Now let us come to the remaining part of the Sacrament [of Penance]. We believe that upon this forgiveness of sins [in it], that is, after the remission of that eternal debt, which God in his justice awards to transgressions against his law, he has been pleased to reserve a certain degree of inferior or temporary punishment, appropriate to the guilt which had been incurred: and it is on this part of the punishment alone, that, according to the Catholic doctrine, satisfaction can be made to God. What the grounds of this belief are, I will state just now. At present, I wish to lay down the doctrine clearly and intelligibly; that it is only with regard to the reserved degree of temporal punishment that we believe the Christian can satisfy the justice of God."*

I must also avail myself of your subsequent description of the Romish doetrine on this subject.

"The doctrine which is thus collected from the word of God, is reducible to these heads: 1. That God, after the remission of sin, retains a lesser chastisement in his power, to be inflicted on the sinner. 2. That penitential works, fasting, alms-deeds, contrite weeping, and fervent prayer, have the power of averting that punishment. 3. That this scheme of God's justice was not a part of the imperfect law, but the unvarying ordinance of his dispensation, anterior to the Mosaic Ritual, and amply confirmed by Christ in the Gospel. 4. That it consequently becomes a part of all true repentance to try to satisfy this Divine justice, by the voluntary assumption of such penitential works, as his revealed truth assures us have efficacy before him."

"These propositions contain the Catholic doctrine concerning Satisfaction."†

This, Sir, is a very fair and correct statement of the doctrines taught in all parts of your Church,‡ and it is quite *consistent* with

* Lectures on principal doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church, vol. ii. p. 41, 42.

† Ibid. p. 47.

‡ Vide Catechism Concil. Trident. Pars ii. De Pœnitentiæ Sacramento, c. xc; Bellarmin. De Pœnitentiæ, l. iv. c. ii. Tournely, De Pœnit. t. ii. p. 3; Bouvier, De Pœnit. p. 128, &c. 280; Trevern, Discussion Amicale,

the following decrees of the Council of Trent; though in this, as in other cases, your authorized doctrines go beyond the definitions of that Conventicle.

"If any one saith, that the *whole* punishment is always remit-
"ted with the *guilt* [of sin] by God, and that the satisfaction of
"penitents is nothing but the faith by which they lay hold on
"Christ's satisfaction for them; Let him be Anathema.

"If any one saith, that no *satisfaction* is made to God for
"sins, as to their *temporal punishment*, through the merits of
"Christ, by punishments inflicted by Him [God] and patiently
"endured, or enjoined by the Priest (not spontaneously under-
"taken), such as fasting, prayer, almsgiving, or other works of
"piety; and therefore that the best penitence is only a new
"life; Let him be Anathema.

"If any one saith, that the keys of the Church are only given
"to loose and not to bind also, and therefore that Priests, in
"imposing punishments on those who confess, act contrary to
"the *end* of the keys and the ordinance of Christ, and that it is
"a fiction that, in virtue of the keys, *temporal punishment re-*
"*mains, for the most part, to be discharged after eternal pun-*
"*ishment has been removed;* Let him be Anathema."*

It might naturally be objected to this doctrine, that the Sacrament of Baptism also remits sin, and yet there is no reserve of *temporal* punishment in this case; so that it seems unreasonable to suppose that when sins are remitted by the Sacrament of Penance, their temporal penalties are made an exception to the general amnesty. But the Council of Trent has its answer to this objection in the following terms.

"The nature of Divine justice seems to require, that they
"who have sinned ignorantly before baptism, should be received
"into favor in a different mode from those, who, having been
"once delivered from the service of sin and of the Devil, and
"having received the gift of the Holy Ghost, have not feared
"knowingly to violate the temple of God, and to grieve the
"Holy Ghost. And it befits the Divine clemency, not to
"pardon our sins without any satisfaction, lest we should take
"occasion to suppose our sins light, and committing injury and
"insult against the Holy Ghost, should fall into more grievous
"sins, laying up for ourselves wrath in the day of wrath."†

I trust, Sir, you will admit that I have endeavoured to give

t. ii. p. 205; Milner, End of Controversy, Letter xlii; Hornyhold, Real Principles of Catholics (on Penance); Faith of Catholics by Berrington and Kirk, p. 339. Walenburch, Opera, t. ii. p. 19; &c.

* Concil. Trident. Sessio xiv.

† Sessio xiv. cap. viii.

the fullest and most authentic exposition of the doctrine of your Church in reference to temporal penalties and satisfactions. Your own statements on the subject are, as I can attest, entirely in accordance with those of all your theologians, and they exactly harmonize with the doctrines of the Council of Trent. There can therefore be no mistake as to what the belief of Romanists really is on these points.

Now, Sir, I have already said, that a large body of your doctrines and practices, to which we object, depends on the doctrine of temporal punishment, and the necessity of satisfying for it by penitential works. This is stated correctly by one of your titular bishops, Dr. Hornyhold, as follows.

"The *eternal* pain is forgiven [in the Sacrament of Penance], "but the *temporal* pain commonly remains, as it appears both "from the necessity of the thing, the instance of David, who "was punished by the death of his children after his sins were "forgiven, 2 Kings, xii., and other instances of temporal "calamities inflicted for offences though pardoned. *And this* "*method of temporal pain* IS THE FOUNDATION OF OUR FAITH *as* "*to sacramental Satisfaction, Indulgences, Purgatory, and* "*Prayer for the dead.*"*

It does not appear evident at first view, how your doctrine of Satisfactions, Purgatory, Indulgences, Masses, and Suffrages or Prayers for the dead, are connected together; and how *vitally* they all depend on the doctrine of temporal penalties above mentioned. Bear with me, then, while I trace the mutual connexion and dependence of these doctrines and practices.

Your Church lays it down as a broad and general principle, that temporal punishment is still due to the Divine justice for sins, after their eternal punishment has been remitted in the Sacrament of Penance. This is the first step.

Secondly, you maintain, that such temporal punishments may be averted by *Satisfactions* or works of Penance, such as fasting, alms, and prayers, which, according to you, satisfy, expiate, or atone for the temporal punishments due to Divine justice.

Thirdly, you argue, that as temporal penalties are absolutely due to Divine justice, if they are not redeemed or expiated in this life by works of penance, they must be endured in the next life; and this is your doctrine of *Purgatory*.

Fourthly, you believe, that the Church has the power of remitting such temporal punishments in this life or in Purgatory by *Indulgences*, in which the merits of Christ and (as many of

* Hornyhold, Real Principles of Catholics, p. 277, 278. Ed. London, 1749.

you hold) of the Saints, are applied to the supply of your deficiency in works of Satisfaction.

Fifthly, you conceive, that as there may be doubts whether the conditions on which Indulgences are given are really fulfilled, and as there may be other reasons for questioning whether a real remission of temporal punishment has been obtained by Indulgences in any particular case, it is necessary to *continue* works of Satisfaction, as if Indulgences had not been granted, and to obtain the Suffrages or Prayers of the Church, especially the *sacrifice of the mass*, which you believe to have great efficacy in remitting the temporal punishments of the living and dead.

Sixthly, you believe, that *one person may perform satisfactory works for another*, and thus obtain the remission or diminution of his temporal punishment in this life or in Purgatory, and that he may also acquire the remissions of temporal punishment conveyed by Indulgences, and apply them to the relief of the dead in the tortures of Purgatory, or even to their delivery from those dreaded regions.

From this, Sir, it is evident, that your doctrine of *Temporal punishment* is the very life-blood, the vital sap, the foundation, the key-stone of your system on all these points. Take this doctrine away, and the whole machinery of your Church is broken asunder. Your Purgatory, your Satisfactions, your Indulgences, your Masses for the dead, Confraternities, privileged altars, scapularies, and beads, medals, and crucifixes, with the whole paraphernalia of indulgenced rites, objects, and prayers, are scattered to the winds. This, Sir, is the root from which springs a huge and fearful mass of superstition, choking and obscuring the pure faith which still lingers among you; and in assailing this error and its branches, which like serpents have clung round your Catholic faith, and by their poisonous breath have been destroying its children, I have no other object than to restore the ancient Roman faith—the faith of the holy Catholic Church—that faith which has always existed, and which, by virtue of the Saviour's promise, shall prevail over "the gates of Hell," over all the machinations of the Powers of Darkness.

Let us come then to the examination of the basis on which this doctrine rests. Let us enquire what reasons you can furnish for believing, that by a general law of God, temporal penalties remain due to Divine justice after sin has been remitted, and that such penalties can be averted.

1. You appeal in the first place to what passes within our minds; I quote from your own writings.

"Is it God's ordinance, that *when he has forgiven sins*, and "so justified the sinner as to place him once more in a state of "grace, he still *reserves* the infliction of some degree of punish- "ment for his transgressions? We say, that *undoubtedly* it is; "and I would appeal, in the first instance, to the *feelings* of any "individual; and I do not believe there is any one, however he "may think himself in a state of favour before God—however he "may flatter himself that his sins are taken away—who will "not answer the appeal. *Why is it, that when calamity falls "upon him he receives it as a punishment for his sins?* Why do "our natural *feelings* prompt us to consider our *domestic and "personal afflictions as sent by God for our transgressions,* "although, at the moment when affliction comes, we may not "be *conscious* of lying under actual guilt? This is a *feeling* "which pervades every form of religion, and more naturally "that of Christ; because it is impossible to be familiar with the "word of God, without receiving an impression that he does "visit the sins of men on their heads, although they may have "endeavoured, with reasonable hope, to obtain their forgiveness. "· · · It is impossible not, more or less, to connect the idea of "suffering inflicted, with that of sin committed."*

You will excuse me, Sir, if I cannot admit the propriety of making any appeal, *in the first instance*, to our natural *feelings*, where a grand principle of religion is in question. If our natural feelings be *in accordance* with the doctrines revealed by God, and conveyed to us by the united voice of Scripture and Catholic Tradition, we may indeed use them as an *additional* argument in favour of the Truth; but if they are adopted as our guides and directors in the interpretation of the word of God; if they are put forward in *the first instance* to bias our minds, you must permit me to say, that considering our natural inclination to evil, and the temptations of the Devil by which we are perpetually assailed, such a method seems eminently calculated to involve us in all sorts of errors and heresies.

I must therefore protest against your appealing in the first instance to our "natural feelings," when the real question is whether a certain principle has been revealed by God.

But, Sir, I am ready and willing to meet you on the ground you have selected. I fully admit that our natural feelings prompt us to connect in some cases the notion of temporal calamities suffered, with that of sin committed and *unrepented of*. We need not look to Scripture and contemplate the case of a world destroyed by the flood for its sins, of Sodom perish-

* Lectures on the Doctrines, &c. of the Catholic Church, vol. ii. p. 42.

ing in fire and brimstone, and of the Jews scattered amidst all nations for their rejection of the Saviour; for we may see with our own eyes, that Divine Providence does *sometimes* make bare its arm, and visibly punish wicked individuals and nations. But, Sir, if we do see this, we also frequently see Vice and Sin triumphant in this world, and we see Virtue and Religion pining in misery and affliction, persecuted, overwhelmed with insults and torments, and lifting their eyes in meek resignation and inward joy to the sublime rewards which are promised to those that suffer for Christ. Need I call to your remembrance the Saints of old, of whom the blessed Apostle Paul writes thus; "They were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that "they might obtain a better resurrection; and others had trial "of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover, of bonds "and imprisonment: they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, "were tempted, were slain with the sword; they wandered "about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, "tormented; *of whom the world was not worthy;* they wandered "in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens, and caves of the "earth." Heb. xi. 35—38. No one can venture to say that these temporal afflictions were endured by the Saints for their *sins;* they were *trials* of their faith, patience, love of God. Listen again to the words of our Lord Himself: "*Blessed* are ye "when men shall revile you and persecute you, and shall say "all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake. Rejoice, "and be exceeding glad: for *great* is your reward in heaven; "for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you." And again, "These things have I spoken unto you, that in "me ye might have peace. *In the world ye shall have tribula-* "*tion;* but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world." Hear the words of St. Paul; "My son, despise not thou the "chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of "Him: *for whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth,* and *scourgeth* "*every son whom He receiveth.*" Attend also to the language of St. Peter, the first of the Apostles, "Now for a season, if "need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations: "*that the trial of your faith,* being much more precious than "of gold that perisheth though it be tried with fire, *might be* "*found unto praise, and honour, and glory,* at the appearing of "Jesus Christ." 1 Pet. i. 6, 7.

It is evident then, that temporal calamities are in many cases, nay as a *general rule,* inflicted on the true disciples of Christ, in order to *try* and strengthen their faith, and to procure for them a greater degree of glory, honour, and praise in the eternal

and heavenly kingdom of Christ. And Sir, this might have been anticipated from the life of Him whom we in common adore, and whom we regard as the grand example to whom our lives ought to be conformed. No being that ever partook of human nature was so severely afflicted with temporal as well as spiritual sorrows and calamities as He who redeemed the world; and yet, none but Himself was ever free from the taint of all sin, original as well as actual. This one example is an irrefragable proof, that temporal calamities and torments are not *necessarily*, in any way, the results of sin committed by him who suffers them.

You cannot deny the truth of this principle without heresy. You *do* not expressly deny it in your argument. But I have brought it thus distinctly forward, because it seems to me that Romanists generally, in their consideration of the afflictions of good men, seem inclined to forget the reason assigned for them by the word of God, and to suppose that they are all intended as *punishments of sin.* Nothing can be more injurious to God than such a notion. It represents Him in the attitude of a severe *Judge* instead of a loving *Parent*—a Parent who educates his children for higher glory by a more rigid discipline. In opposition to such errors, I lay down the following proposition as an article of Catholic faith, deduced directly from the word of God: "THAT TEMPORAL AFFLICTIONS AND CALAMITIES ARE "COMMONLY IMPOSED BY GOD'S MERCY ON THE JUSTIFIED, IN "ORDER THAT THEY MAY OBTAIN A GREATER AND MORE GLORIOUS "REWARD."

Now, Sir, I come to your arguments from our "*feelings.*" You imagine, "*that when calamity falls upon*" any one who thinks himself in a state of favour before God, "he receives it "as a *punishment for his sins.*"—You assert, that "our natural "feelings prompt us to consider our *domestic and personal* "*afflictions*, as sent by God, *for our transgressions*"—that "it is "*impossible* not, more or less, to connect the idea of *suffering* "*inflicted*, with that of *sin committed.*" I have no doubt, Sir, that yourself and other Romanists are in the habit of regarding such temporal afflictions of the justified as punishments for their past sins; but I must say, that any one who enters into the spirit of the word of God; any one who can appreciate the glorious and merciful objects of a Heavenly Father in those afflictions, will view them in a widely different light. The carnal and ignorant may see in them nothing but exactions of Divine *justice*, penalties for sin *partially forgiven.* But the spiritual mind will trace in them the discipline of LOVE, not in-

flicting penalties for the past, but preparing the way for a more glorious futurity.

Such afflictions therefore are to be regarded as signs of love, not of vengeance. They are to be desired more than dreaded. They are to be endured, not expiated. If they are not endured, the Christian suffers loss. If they are removed, his reward is less. If you fast, and pray, and with many tears beseech God to remove from you these temporal calamities, you may indeed prevail, though one might almost doubt whether any prayer like this, proceeding from a heart unable to appreciate the Divine mercy, would be heard. The case of the inhabitants of Gadara however shows, that God will hear the prayer of those who intreat Him to "depart out of their coasts;" and it may be apprehended that He will also hear the prayers of those who ignorantly pray that his *grace* of afflictive dispensations may be removed from them—of those who regard his graces as calamities, his works of love as punishments.

You spend your lives in endeavouring to avert these *temporal afflictions*, which you regard as so many exactions of God's justice. It is very true that you regard them as *punishments for sin*, and that they therefore appear to you in a most formidable light. But still you *really* are endeavouring to avert what is not a punishment for sin, but a mark of God's favour. The temporal afflictions of the righteous are seen by you in a false light. You think them judgments, while they are really mercies.

But you will answer, when thus pressed, that you *do* admit that temporal evils are frequently intended for spiritual blessings, though you hold that they are also often intended as punishments of sin remitted; and that it is not your design to avert them in the former sense, but in the latter.

I would enquire, then, first, (admitting your doctrine for the sake of argument,) what means you have of determining that such temporal evils may not be, at once, punishments for sins past, and means of future improvement and reward? *If they be so*, you inflict an injury on yourselves by seeking to avert them, and yet you cannot deny that the case is possible.

Secondly, I ask, whether such temporal evils, if they are (as you imagine) inflicted for the punishment of sin remitted as regards its greater penalties, may not be *necessary* to preserve ourselves from falling again into sin, or *necessary* for the instruction of others? And here again is a reason why we should not earnestly labour to avert such temporal evils; because in so doing we may be only interfering with our own salvation or hat of our brethren, and counteracting the designs of God.

So much for your appeal to our "feelings," and to the supposed connexion between temporal suffering and *sin*. If you persist in asserting that temporal afflictions have a necessary connexion with sin, you accuse our Saviour himself of sin, and fall into damnable heresy.

II. I now turn to the proofs which you adduce from Scripture in support of your doctrine. And here let me be permitted to state the question more clearly.

It is not a question then, whether temporal penalties are, in the order of God's providence, (especially under the former dispensations,) due to, and inflicted on, *sin;* but whether they are, under the Gospel, due to sin *remitted and pardoned.*

Hence you will at once admit, that it would be the merest sophistry and folly to attempt to prove your doctrine from the simple fact, that temporal penalties for sin have been inflicted on *sinners* under the old or new dispensations, while the question is whether they have been inflicted on *pardoned* sinners.

In considering the testimonies which have been advanced in support of your view, I must here turn from your scanty collection of scriptural examples, to the fuller and more systematic argument of Tournely. He collects "those places of Scripture which "signify that God, *after the pardon of sin*, still requires an "*avenging* temporal punishment (ultricem pœnam temporalem) "from the penitent."

"The example of David (2 Kings [Samuel] xii.) is especially "remarkable. For although Nathan had heard from the pro-"phet (verse 13,) 'The Lord also hath put away thy sin; thou "shalt not die,' he immediately adds, 'Howbeit, because, by "this deed thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of "the Lord to blaspheme, the child also that is born unto thee "shall surely die;' and verse 10, 'Now therefore the sword shall "never depart from thine house; because thou hast despised "me, and hast taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be thy "wife.' God remits on one side the guilt and *eternal punish-"ment;* but on the other he requires *temporal punishment* as "well from the son as the father himself, not merely for the "discipline and amendment of David, and the example of others, "as the Innovators and especially Daille commonly reply, but "also for the punishment and chastisement of pardoned sin. "'Because by this deed thou hast given occasion to the enemies "of the Lord to blaspheme. . . . . Because thou hast despised "me,' saith the holy context, which particle 'Because' denotes "that the *sin* of David was the real *cause* of all the evils which "he suffered, and not merely their *occasion*, as Daille cavils:

"for with what more significant terms could Scripture have "expressed the *cause?*" (Tournely, De Pœnit. t. ii. p. 4.)

You will admit, Sir, that this is as clear and cogent an argument as can well be deduced from this passage in favor of your view. Let us now consider it more closely. It is obvious, therefore, that God by Nathan remitted the extreme punishment which was due to David's sin. "Thou shalt not die," and that at the same time he imposed a lesser temporal punishment for his sin, "The child that is born unto thee shall surely die." But, Sir, I must deny, that this example furnishes any necessary proof that a similar mode of proceeding characterizes the present dealings of God with us. A temporal penalty of some sort was necessary when God *visibly* interfered in the affairs of men. But now that his guidance is entirely spiritual and invisible, temporal penalties are no longer necessary in the same way; and had David lived under the Christian dispensation, his crime might not have involved such consequences when truly repented of. Under the former dispensation the case was widely different. Had the favoured servant of God, the chosen pastor of God's people, been permitted to commit most grievous and *scandalous* sins, without any visible signs of God's indignation, the most fatal results must have followed. The justice of God would have been impugned. Sin would have been encouraged.

From all this it is plain, that no inference can be deduced from the above passage in proof of your tenets. But, Sir, there *is* a doctrine clearly taught by this example, and by the subsequent conduct of David, which is fatal to your view. We learn from it, that such temporal penalties inflicted for sin *cannot be averted.* Was the threatened punishment of David averted by his prayers, fastings, tears, prostrations, and other works of "*satisfaction*"? No! *The child died.* How vain therefore is it for you to imagine that such temporal penalties of sin can be averted! Observe, too, that when temporal punishments were afterwards sent to David in the case of Absalom, and of the numbering of the people, he did *not attempt to avert them* by any works of satisfaction. He submitted to the Divine will, and his example is meant to teach us the duty of submission to all similar dispensations of God.

Tournely continues thus:

"In the same II Book of Kings [Samuel] c. xxiv. although "God had pardoned David's sin, which he had committed in "numbering the people, yet in verse 12, a *remaining* punish- "ment is set forth to be discharged, and he is given the option "of war, famine, or the plague." (Tournely, ibid.)

On this argument I must observe, first, that there is no evi-

dence whatever that God had *pardoned* David's sins. It is true indeed that David "said unto the Lord, I have sinned greatly "in that I have done; and now, I beseech thee, O Lord, take "away the iniquity of thy servant: for I have done very fool-"ishly." But all we know of the *result* is, that God offered him the choice of three grievous penalties. There is not any allusion to God's having *pardoned* his sin when the penalty was inflicted. Consequently this passage does not relate to the question before us. If it did, however, if David's sin had been pardoned when the Prophet offered him the choice of war, pestilence, or famine, the conclusion would be fatal to your doctrine. *The punishment was inflicted*, and David instructed by the case of Uriah, that such punishments *could not be averted by any works of satisfaction or penance*, submitted himself to the Divine will.

Tournely continues: "In the 32d chapter of Exodus, when "Moses interceded with God not to destroy the whole people "on account of their crime in adoring the golden calf, God is "said to have been appeased, verse 14, yet in verse 34 God saith, "'Nevertheless, in the day when I visit I will visit their sin upon "them.'" (Ibid.)

In this case God evidently *did not forgive* the sin of the children of Israel. He only *commuted* the sentence of utter destruction which He had pronounced against that people for their idolatry, into chastisements of a different character, at the prayer and intercession of Moses. There is no evidence that the people repented and were *forgiven* their sin. On the contrary, the Lord said unto Moses, in reply to his entreaties for their forgiveness, "Whosoever hath sinned against me, *him will I blot "out of my book.*" (verse 33.) And in sign of his wrath we find, that "the Lord *plagued* the people, because they made "the calf, which Aaron made." (verse 35.) What advantage then can you derive from this passage? It is adduced to prove that *sins pardoned* are subject to temporal punishment. But the sin of the children of Israel here mentioned was *not pardoned.*

I return to Tournely. "In the 14th chapter of Numbers, "the Lord was angry at the murmuring of the people, and was "so appeased by the prayer of Moses as to say, (verse 20,) 'I "have pardoned according to thy word;' yet adds, (verse 22.) "'All those men which have seen my glory and my miracles "which I did . . . . shall not see the land.'" (Ibid.)

In this case it is obvious, that the "pardon" granted by God did not imply the forgiveness of the *sin* committed, and the *justification* of those who had committed it, for He speaks of the

congregation as those that "have *tempted* me now these ten "times, and *have not hearkened* to my voice," (ver. 22.); "them "that *provoked* me," (ver. 23.); "this *evil* congregation which "murmur against me," (ver. 27.): He says, "Your little ones ". . . . shall know the land which *ye have despised*," (verse 31.) "Each day for a year shall ye *bear your iniquities*," (verse 34.) "I the Lord have said, I will surely do it unto all this *evil con-* "*gregation that are gathered together against me*," (verse 35.) Such is the language of God to the congregation of Israel *after* he had "pardoned" them, (ver. 20.) And it is plain therefore that this pardon was not a remission of *their sin*, but a remission of the *immediate destruction by pestilence*, and the *disinheritance* which God had threatened, (ver. 12.) The temporal punishments then with which they were visited, were not punishments of *sin remitted*—punishments of the *justified*. They were chastisements of unbelieving and impenitent sinners. Is this the interpretation of unaided human reason? Is it not the interpretation of St. Paul in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where speaking of those that fell in the wilderness in consequence of this Divine decree, he says, "To whom sware he that they should "not enter into his rest, but to them that *believed not?* So we "see that they could not enter in because of their *unbelief*." (Hebr. iii. 18, 19.) And is it this *unbelieving*, this *impenitent*, this *evil* congregation, that you would hold up as a proof that temporal penalties are inflicted on the *believing* and *justified* penitent?

I return to your proofs; "Add to these those places of Scrip- "ture in which just and holy men declare that they are punished "and afflicted in this life for their sins,—doubtless *past and al-* "*ready pardoned by God*. Thus Tobias, c. iii. v. 4, said, 'Be- "cause we have not obeyed thy commandments, therefore we "have been delivered for a spoil, and unto captivity, and unto "death, and for a proverb of reproach to all the nations among "which we are dispersed. Deal not with me according to *my* "*sins* and my father's, &c.'" (Tournely, ibid.)

There is no evidence whatever that Tobias, in offering this prayer, believed that his sins *had been pardoned*. On the contrary, his prayer infers throughout, that he believed himself *still* subject to God's *displeasure for sin*, and to the punishment which resulted from it. He prays God "not to punish him for his sins "and ignorances," (ver. 3.) evidently supposing that he was still liable to the *full* measure of penalty due to them. This passage therefore cannot afford any support to your doctrine of a *portion* of the punishment due to sin remaining after the greater part of its penalties have been remitted, and after the sin has

been remitted, and the sinner *justified* by the Sacrament of Penance.

"In the third chapter of Daniel, ver. 28, the three children "placed in the furnace say, 'In truth and in judgment thou hast "brought on us all these things, *because of our sins*,'" &c. (Tournely, ibid.)

I might object to this passage at once, as an interpolation, and as forming no part of the word of God, because it is not found in the Hebrew original of the Book of Daniel. But it is needless for my purpose to do so; because it is evident from these words and from the whole context, that the three children believed that their sins *had not been remitted*, and consequently the case has nothing to do with your doctrine.

"The wise man pronounces generally (Proverbs iii. 12.) that "'whom the Lord loveth he correcteth; even as a father the "son whom he delighteth.' The same is said, Hebr. xii. 6. and "Rev. iii. 19." (Tournely, ibid.)

Certainly, the Lord does intend temporal afflictions as marks of *love* to the justified. This is exactly what we contend for. We view them as a discipline of love, intended to promote the glory and happiness of believers. You regard them as modes of Divine *vengeance* for sin *already pardoned*. Which of these two doctrines is the most consistent with the passages just quoted? Which is the most calculated to sweeten the afflictions of the world? Which is most conducive to the glory of God? Which is most calculated to cause love of God and dependence on him? I am content to leave this to the conscience of my readers, and of yourself.

But I must now endeavour to collect your remaining arguments from Scripture, for the purpose of seeing the utmost extent of what can be said in maintenance of your principle. I turn then to Bellarmine, and glean from his pages what follows.

He argues, "that *death itself* is often inflicted as the penalty "of sin, even after its guilt has been remitted," from Genesis ii. 'In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die;' and Rom. v., 'By one man sin entered the world, and death by sin, 'and so death passed upon all men, in whom all have sinned.' Death then is the punishment of original sin, and yet the guilt and eternal penalty of original sin is remitted by baptism. Thus all men suffer temporal penalties for sin remitted.*

In reply to this we may most fully admit, that death is the penalty of *original sin;* but we deny that any argument can be drawn from this to prove that temporal penalties are inflicted on *actual sins* after they have been pardoned. For if all men suffer

* Bellarmine, De Pœnitentia, lib. iv. c. ii.

death for original sin, it is for the sin of *Adam* imputed to them, and not for any sin committed *by themselves*. So that sins which *we ourselves* commit, may be free from any temporal penalties after their remission. All then that can be collected from the fact alleged by Bellarmine is, that God *might, if he pleased,* inflict temporal penalties on our actual sins after they were remitted. This we fully concede in the abstract, though we do not conceive it consistent with the actual scheme of redemption. But the question is, whether *He has really made such a regulation*, and there is no proof here that He has done so.

Another argument is deduced from the penalty awarded to Moses and Aaron for their sin at the water of Meribah, when God declared to them that they should not enter the promised land. (Numbers xx. 12.) And accordingly Aaron died in Mount Hor, (ver. 28.) and Moses in Mount Nebo, (Deut. xxxiv. 5.) Yet no one will deny that Moses and Aaron were restored to the favour of God after their sin at Meribah.*

To this it may be replied, that as Moses and Aaron had not believed God "to sanctify Him in the eyes of the children of "Israel," (Numb. xx. 12), and had thus *publicly* offended against God, it was essentially necessary that some mark of Divine displeasure against their sin should be inflicted; because God at that time ruled his people by a system of temporal rewards and punishments, and guided them in a direct and visible manner. But under the Christian dispensation He no longer does so, and therefore sins equal to that of Moses need not necessarily be visited by temporal penalties. The justice and sanctity of his government no longer demand any such dispensations. The conduct of Moses and Aaron however concur to prove what is fatal to your view, for they did not seek to *avert* the threatened penalty in any way, and the penalty itself was strictly and literally exacted.

The only other argument which seems worthy of notice, is from 1 Kings xiii.—the case of the prophet who was slain by a lion on account of his sins; and yet, as Bellarmine argues, "it "cannot be doubtful that he requested and obtained pardon "from the Lord; for in proof of the *sanctity* in which he had "died, the lion stood near the body without eating it, and did "not dare even to touch the prophet's ass."†

* Bellarmine, ibid.

† Ibid. Bouvier, Bishop of Maus, adds one other argument, from the circumstance of Adam's suffering death for his sin, though that sin had doubtless been pardoned. (De Pœnit. p. 128.) But it must be remembered, that in this case God was bound by his own positive promise, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." God is not bound by any similar promise under the gospel to inflict temporary penalties or death for our sins. Consequently the punishment of Adam proves nothing.

This is just as good a proof of the sanctity of the *ass* as of the prophet. The lion touched neither: therefore the one and the other died in sanctity! What folly is this! The plain reason of the miracle was to show that this penalty was distinctly the work of God—to furnish an undeniable proof of his punishment of disobedience.

These, Sir, are your proofs from Scripture. They are the proofs adduced by the Catechism of the Council of Trent, by Bellarmine, Tournely, Delahogue, Bouvier, Milner, Hornyhold, yourself, and all your writers. And now what can they avail you? The passages which all your most eminent theologians have brought from Scripture, either subvert your doctrine, or utterly fail to prove its truth. They either speak of the temporal penalties of sin *not pardoned*, or they relate to circumstances when temporal and visible penalties were *necessary* in the Divine economy; or they show that temporal afflictions are not *penalties of sin*. Produce if you can any other and better proofs from Scripture, and I shall be ready to discuss them; but do not weary us by the repetition of refuted arguments.

III. I would here gladly enter on the discussion of certain passages from the Fathers which have been adduced in favour of your doctrine, and demonstrate from them the falsity of that very doctrine; but space fails me at present; and this discussion is not, strictly speaking, necessary, because if you are *manifestly* devoid of any scriptural proofs for your doctrine, it cannot, according to the doctrine laid down by Veron,* Bossuet, and many of your most eminent theologians, (in accordance with the whole body of the Fathers,†) be any *article of faith;* and consequently your doctrines of Satisfactions, Purgatory, and Indulgences, built upon it, cannot be articles of faith; and the Council of Trent must have erred in declaring them articles of faith.

But, Sir, I have not yet concluded my task, which would be incomplete if it were limited merely to a refutation of your arguments in defence of the doctrine of temporal penalties. There are specific objections to that doctrine, which must now be offered to your notice.

* Veron, in his Regula Fidei, cap. i. sect 2, says, that "two things must be united in order that any doctrine should be an article of the Catholic faith: one, that it be revealed of God by the prophets, apostles, or canonical authors; the other, that it be proposed by the Church.

† See Treatise on the Church, vol. ii. p. 10—17.—Newman on Romanism, Lect. xiii. Usher's answer to a Jesuit, c. ii. Taylor's Dissuasive, p. ii. b. i. s. ii. And the Norissian Prize Essay for this year, by the Rev. D. A. Beaufort, M.A. (Parker, London)

Your belief then is, that Divine *justice* exacts the debt of temporal punishment for sin, after its eternal punishment has been remitted. You do not imagine that the *mercy* or *love* of God demands these penalties. No:—it is (as all your writers say) the *justice* of God which is to be satisfied by temporal penalties.

Let me establish this by some citations from your own writings. You say, "It is only with regard to the reserved degree "of temporal punishment that we believe the Christian can "satisfy the *justice* of God."* . . . "This scheme of God's *jus-* "*tice* was not a part of the imperfect law, but the unvarying "ordinance of his dispensation anterior to the Mosaic ritual, "and amply confirmed by Christ in the Gospel." . . . "It con- "sequently becomes a part of true repentance to try to satisfy this "*Divine justice* by the voluntary assumption of such penitential "works." . . . "These propositions contain the *Catholic doc-* "*trine* concerning Satisfaction."† I need scarcely say, that the language of all writers of your Communion is exactly similar; and it is obviously necessary that it should be so, for if temporal *punishments* are due for remitted sin, they can only be due to Divine *justice*.

Now if Divine *justice* still remains to be satisfied after the remission of sin, it must require what is *in justice* due to sin, that is, *eternal punishment*, and consequently the remission of sin is, according to your doctrine, a mere name. So that your doctrine is absolutely subversive of its own foundation, and of the foundation of the Christian's hopes.

And besides this, Divine *justice* which demands an *infinite* punishment for sin, cannot receive any finite or limited punishments in part payment for the debt due to it. It demands an infinite punishment—a punishment not made up of parts—a punishment *infinitely* greater than all that human imagination could even *conceive*. To imagine therefore that the punishment due to Divine and Infinite *justice* for sin, can be divided or separated into eternal and temporal; and that *temporal* and eternal punishments *together* satisfy the justice of God; is as absurd as it would be to imagine, that a grain of sand, *together with the universe*, make up Infinity. It is to suppose that Infinite *justice* can require what is, in comparison, less than the least of things, *in addition* to an infinite penalty.

But Divine justice has received an adequate sacrifice. The merits of our Saviour Christ, both God and man, were equal to

* Lectures on the principal doctrines, &c. of the Catholic Church, vol. ii. p. 42.

† Ibid. p. 47.

the demands of Divine justice, and they were accepted. Henceforth the *justice* of God was appeased; and it has no claims on those to whom the infinite merits of Christ have been applied by true repentance. They may rest in confidence on the mercy of God, knowing indeed that many temporal calamities will befall them, according to the promise of Christ; but not regarding those calamities as exactions of God's *justice partially satisfied.* They know that unrepented sin may again make them liable to God's judgments in this world and in eternity. But they firmly believe that an infinite atonement has been made for sins which demanded an infinite punishment, and as they believe that Divine *justice* has been fully and entirely satisfied, they also believe that it can have *no further claims.* Consequently the doctrine that temporal punishment can be due to the *justice* of God for sin remitted through Christ, is to them an impossibility. Did they reckon themselves still liable, when justified, to demands from God's *justice*, the very foundation of their hope of salvation would be shattered to pieces.

But, Sir, dangerous and pernicious as your doctrine on this point has been proved, I have not yet disclosed its crowning absurdity and wickedness. It is the doctrine of the Council of Trent itself, that "*Justification* is not remission of sin merely, "but also *sanctification*, and the renewal of the inner man by "the voluntary reception of *grace and divine gifts;* so that he "who was unrighteous is made *righteous*, and the enemy be-"comes a *friend* and *an heir* according to the hope of eternal "life . . . when a man is justified, and *united to Jesus Christ*, "he receives, together with the remission of sins, the following "gifts bestowed upon him at the same time, namely, *faith, hope* "and *charity.*"*

Justification is then something more than the mere remission of sins—it is the restoration of the sinner to a state of grace, to union with his God, to all the glorious privileges of a "child of "God."

And yet, Sir, in the face of this most undoubted truth—in the face of their own belief, and the belief of the Roman Church —your writers have the almost incredible folly and wickedness to assert, that the justified and beloved children of God *are* liable to the Divine *wrath* and *vengeance!* Yes. It is their doctrine that temporal punishments are exacted from a justified believer by the *vengeance* of God. Let me produce the following proofs. Your celebrated controversialists, Bishops Adrian and Peter de Walenburch, write thus: "Since holy Scripture shows by many "examples, that God, after remitting the guilt and eternal punish-

* Concil. Trid. Sess. vi. cap. vii.

"ment of sins, chastises sinners with temporal punishments, Ca-
"tholics think that voluntary afflictions undertaken from the
"love of God and faith working by love appease the *wrath* of
"God" (*placare iram Dei*).* Tournely says, "that God after
"the pardon of sin still exacts a *revenging* temporal punish-
"ment from the penitent, (*ultricem pœnam temporalem a pœni-
"tente adhuc reposcere.*")† Your own expressions are equally strong. In arguing for the necessity of Satisfaction, you say,—
"Even so, when God remits a weight of eternal punishment, it
"seems but fair that the outrage done to his divine Majesty
"should be repaired by outward acts, expressive of sorrow, and
"directed to *appease his wrath*, and avert those scourges which
"he still reserves in his hand." You afterwards state your belief "that the sinner may, by punishing himself, by performing
"certain works propitiatory before God, avert his *anger*." (Lectures, ii. 48, 51.) And these, Sir, are not mere incautious expressions; they are the natural and necessary result of your doctrine, that remitted sins are still liable to the demands of Divine justice. For the Scripture teaches us, that sin is the object of God's wrath and vengeance, and if any sin be still subject to the demands of his justice, it is equally subject to those of his wrath and vengeance. So that, according to your doctrine, the justified and pardoned believer is still liable to God's wrath! The adopted, beloved, and sanctified child, is still subject to God's vengeance! God loves and hates, saves and destroys, at the same moment; and the same beings are at once reckoned with the elect and the reprobate, with angels and with devils! Can it be possible for absurdity, contradiction and impiety to go beyond this? And yet this is the necessary, the inevitable consequence to which your doctrine leads.

Such, Sir, is your doctrine of temporal penalties for remitted sins—a doctrine unsupported by reason and experience, rejected by Scripture, contradictory to itself, and subversive to the Christian's hope of salvation. And yet it is on this doctrine that your whole body of doctrine concerning Satisfactions, Purgatory, and Indulgences vitally depends. Doubt that temporal penalties are by any Divine law now inflicted on sin repented of, and what need can there be for all the Satisfactions prescribed by you for the remission of temporal penalties? What necessity is there for Purgatory to complete those penalties not discharged in this life? What need for Indulgences to remit them? What need for Suffrages and Masses for the dead, to relieve souls from the fiery torments of Purgatory?

* Walenburch, Opera, t. iii. p. 19.
† Tournely, De Pœnit, t. ii. p. 13.

LETTER VIII.

ON THE WORSHIP OF IMAGES AND RELICS.

SIR:

THERE is no charge which Romanists are more ready to repel with indignation and scorn, than that of *idolatrous worship of images and relics.* When such a subject is even hinted at, we are absolutely overpowered with a torrent of invective, sarcasm, ridicule; with appeals to our common sense, our charity, our decency; with the boldest assertions of innocence; nay, even with anathemas against idolatry. This extreme sensibility on the subject of image-worship will, to a discerning mind, indicate the consciousness of some unsoundness, some lurking feeling that all is not as it should be. Were Romanism in truth as free from idolatry as its advocates would have us believe, we should find them more at ease on the subject than they seem to be.

Let us cite a few passages in illustration of what has been said.

I shall first produce your own language. You are quite indignant on this occasion.

"Nor yet, my brethren, is this the worst feature of the case; for a graver and more awful charge is laid upon us in consequence of our belief: we are even denounced as idolaters, because we pay a certain reverence, and, if you please, worship, to the Saints of God, and because we honour their outward emblems and representatives. Idolaters! Know ye, my brethren, the import of this name? that it is the most frightful charge that can be laid to the score of any Christian? Then, gracious God! what must it be when flung as an accusation upon those who have been baptized in the name of Christ, who have tasted the sacred gift of his body, &c. Assuredly they know not what they say who deliberately and directly make this enormous charge; and they have to answer for *misrepresentation*, yea, for *calumny of the blackest die*, who hesitate not again and again to repeat, with heartless earnestness and perseverance, this most odious of accusations, without being fully assured (which they cannot be) in their consciences and before God, that it really can be proved. . . . You will not open *a single Catholic writer*,

from the folio decrees of Councils, down to the smallest catechism, placed in the hands of the youngest children, in which you will not find it expressly taught, that it is sinful to pay the same homage or worship to the Saints, or to the greatest of the Saints, or the highest of the Angels in heaven, which we pay to God,"* &c. &c.

Let us next hear the Declaration of "the Vicars Apostolic."

'*Ignorance or malice* has gone so far as to charge the Catholic Church with *idolatry* in the worship of the Saints, and of the images of Christ and of the Saints. The Catholic Church teaches that idolatry is one of the greatest crimes that can be committed against the majesty of God; and every true member of this Church *shudders at the idea of such a crime*, and feels grievously injured by so horrid an imputation. . . . To *worship* the images of Christ or of the Saints, the word is here again understood by Catholics only of an *inferior* and relative respect shown to images. . . . To condemn this relative regard for images or pictures, would be to condemn the very feelings of nature. To charge a Catholic with idolatry because the term *worship*, meaning only an inferior and relative regard, is found in the ancient and modern Liturgies of his Church, is not consistent with *candour* or *charity*. The charge that the Catholic Church sanctions the praying to images is a calumny, and carries with it an imputation of stupidity too gross to be noticed,"† &c.

Dr. Baines shall speak next.

"You have been told that 'Romanists worship images, as did the pagans of old, and that, like them, they give the glory of the eternal God to the works of men's hands.' I know how common such accusations are, and how *otherwise* respectable are the sources from which they spring, or I should fear to *insult your understandings* by supposing that any of you are capable of believing them. For is it possible that in an age and country which claims to be so learned and enlightened, men should be found capable of believing that the majority of the Christian world are so ignorant, so debased, so stupid, so *wicked*, as to give divine honours to a lifeless and senseless image? Really, my Christian brethren, I blush to think it should be necessary

* Wiseman, Controv. Lectures, vol. ii. pp, 93, 84. I cannot but admire the ingenuity of this disclaimer. You deny that divine honours are due to the Saints or their images; but you forget to notice our charge, that divine honours are paid to Images of Christ and to the Cross.

† Declaration of Vicars Apostolic, 1826, Section iv.

to say that Catholics, as well as you, know the folly, and detest as much as you, the impiety of giving divine honours to a lifeless piece of wood or ivory. . . I shall then merely add, in the words of St. Paul, in conformity with the repeated decisions of the Catholic Church, and *in unison with the voice of every Catholic in the world*, anathema to the man who worships an image as God, or gives to it divine honours,* or believes it to possess any portion of divine power or virtue, or places his trust in it, or prays to it, or believes it to be any thing more than a lifeless, senseless lump of matter. . . . And, my brethren, I will add, without hesitation or fear, anathema to myself if the doctrine I have here explained to you is not the true and universally received doctrine of the Catholic Church."†

But, Sir, notwithstanding all these vehement protestations, it is clear, by your own admissions and by those of other Romanists, that the Roman Church is not so perfectly immaculate as you would lead us to suppose.

We have first the following admission, "I shall be told that the mnnner in which the poorer Catholics pray before her (the Virgin's) images and those of the Saints, betrays *a greater fervour of devotion than they display at other times;* nay, that it even indicates a superstitious trust in those outward symbols themselves. This appearance may be partly true."‡

Nor is it merely that *appearances* are against you, a truth which every traveller is ready to attest, but Roman Catholics themselves are obliged to admit, that those appearances are not fallacious; in short, that there are *real abuses* in the Roman communion on this subject.

"Experience," says Van Espen, "has long ago taught how difficult it is to guard against irreligious or superstitious worship, *in some degree savouring of idolatry*, in this public and external veneration of images and statues, especially when the base gain of the priests mingles itself with it, combined with the ignorance or excessive credulity of the people. . . . Indeed, notwithstanding many decrees of Councils, and especially the salutary regulations of the Council of Trent, *so great and so various is the superstitions, and (as it were) idolatrous worship of*

* Dr. Baines, following the general doctrine of Roman Catholic divines, denies that divine honour or Latria is due to images simply per se. This does not by any means imply that he refuses them such honour where they are considered as representing their originals. This distinction will be noticed further on.

† P. A. Baines, D.D., Sermon on Faith, Hope and Charity.

‡ Wiseman, Letter to Newman, p. 24.

images and statues amongst the common and unlearned people, that the Gallican bishops (in the ninth century) do not seem to have had unfounded apprehensions that the unlearned populace would be with difficulty withdrawn from the superstitious worship and unfitting adoration of images, if their worship were allowed. . . It is certain that the manifold superstitious worship of holy images, owes, for the greater part if not entirely, its origin, progress, and stability, to the fifthy lucre of priests, either secular or regular, which they seek from the popular concourse and indiscreet affection of the people to certain images."*

The same evils were acknowledged by the learned Gerson, in the fifteenth century. "Judge," said he, "whether so great a variety of images and pictures in the Church be expedient, and whether they do not sometimes pervert numbers of the unlearned people to idolatry."†

This, Sir, explains in some degree the irritation which Romish authors invariably display when the subject of idolatry is mentioned. But let us examine the subject a little more closely, and enquire whether superstitious and *idolatrous* practices in reference to images and relics are mere *abuses* in the Church of Rome, or whether they are not taught, allowed, and sanctioned by the highest authorities amongst you.

I undertake then to demonstrate that, notwithstanding all your disclaimers, DIRECT AND FORMAL IDOLATRY—WHAT YOU YOURSELVES ADMIT TO BE IDOLATRY—IS AUTHORIZED AND APPROVED IN YOUR COMMUNION, AND THAT YOU ARE PREVENTED BY YOUR OWN PRINCIPLES FROM CONDEMNING IT.

First, then, what is idolatry, according to Romanists?

"It is the giving to man, or to anything created, that homage, that adoration, and that worship, which God hath reserved unto Himself."‡ "Idolatry pays divine honour to creatures."§—"Those only are idolaters who offer to a creature the honour and worship due to God."‖ Idolatry is, according to Ligorio, "when honour is given to the creature as to God. This is done (as Lessius noteth,) not merely by sacrifice, but also by any sign of honour, by which any one intends to submit himself to a creature as to God, e. g. by genuflexion, offering incense, uncovering the head," &c.¶ It is, according to Amort, "the

* Van Espen Opera, tom. ii. pp. 240, 241, ed. Lovan. 1732.
† Gerson, Defect. Eccl. n. 67, tom. i. Opera, p. 207, Ed. Paris. 1606.
‡ Wiseman, Controv. Lectures, ii. 93.
§ Hornyhold, Real Principles of Catholics, p. 150.
‖ Trevern, Discuss. Amicale, tom. ii. p. 276.
¶ Ligorio, Theologia Moralis, l. iii. n. 12.

adoration of a creature as God."* Thomas Aquinas remarks that idolatry is a species of superstition, "which is chiefly practised when divine worship is attributed to one to whom it is not due; but it ought to be paid only to the supreme, uncreated God."† I need not pursue this point any further. All your writers, without a single exception, agree that idolatry consists in offering to creatures that supreme worship which is only due to God. Secondly. What, according to Romanists, is the supreme worship due to God, or how is it designated by them?

Bellarmine says, "There are as many sorts of adoration or worship as there are species of excellence. But, as far as relates to the present purpose, there are three species of excellence. The first is the *Divine* and *infinite* excellence, to which corresponds the first species of worship, which is called by theologians LATRIA."‡ "It is to be observed," says Tournely, "that there are three sorts of adoration or worship, LATRIA, which is due to God only; *Dulia* which is due to creatures; *Hyperdulia*, which is bestowed on the blessed Virgin."§ "The words LATRIA and DULIA have been rightly employed to discriminate properly the supreme worship due to God only, from the inferior worship with which Angels or saints are honoured."‖ "There are some of the common people," said the Wallenburghs, "who often understand the word 'adoration' as signifying *the highest honour due to God, which we call* LATRIA, or as meaning the adoration of Latria, which however has been taught by no Council. Nay rather, the Second Synod of Nice says that images are to be adored, but it adds, *not with Latria*."¶ In like manner you cite the following words of St. Augustine, as exhibiting the same distinction which is made by Romanists. "We venerate the martyrs. . . But with that worship which the Greeks call λατρεία and which in Latin cannot be expressed by one word—as it is a worship properly due only to the Divinity —*with that worship we worship God alone*."** Trevern, in remarking on a decree of the second Synod of Nice, which Romanists receive as œcumenical, says, "The Council distinguishes by these certain characters, the adoration *due to God alone*, from

* Amort. Theologia, tom. xx. p. 272.
† Aquinas, Summa Theologiæ, Secunda Secundæ, quæst. xciv. art. 1.
‡ Bellarmin. de Sanct. Beatit. l. i. c. xii.
§ Tournely, De Incarnatione, p. 782.
‖ Perrone, De cultu Creat. cap. i. Præl. Theol. tom. iv. p. 341.
¶ Walenburch, Controvers. tom. ii. p. 206
** Wiseman, Controv. Lect. ii. 113.

those which may be paid to other objects: it calls the first, the adoration of LATRIA, which pertains *exclusively to God.*"*

I ought to apologize for pressing on the attention of the reader a distinction so well known, and so universally received by all your writers. If you are charged with paying idolatrous worship to images or relics, you are ready with your reply, "that no calumny can be more gross, because the honour which you give to images and relics, is infinitely inferior to, is altogether different from, that true LATRIA which you only pay to God."

And, Sir, I am ready to concede, that as far as *theory* goes, Romanists are not guilty of the monstrous absurdity of paying divine worship or LATRIA to stocks and stones *per se*, or even to *Saints* and *Angels* when they are represented. To do them justice, Romanists are careful enough, in their theological writings, and especially in controversies with us, to draw distinctions between the Latria which they pay to God, and the Hyperdulia, and the Dulia which they pay to the Virgin, and to all other Saints and their images.† I do not charge you then with advocating *in theory*, the lawfulness of offering divine honours to the images or relics of *the Saints*,‡ nor do I say, that you teach the people to *pray to* images. There is quite enough in your principles and practice to excite our most serious alarm for your condition, without imputing to you any thing which you can fairly rebut and deny.

But what I do mean to assert and maintain is this; that LATRIA—the very honour due to *God alone*, by your own confession, is paid to creatures in the Church of Rome—that this worship has been openly avowed and recommended by your most eminent divines—that it is a lawful practice amongst you, sanctioned by authority—that it has never been censured—that it cannot be condemned by any Romanist.

But to descend to particulars; I undertake to demonstrate, that, according to the doctrine of your most eminent theolo-

* Trevern, Discuss. Amic. tom. ii. p. 323.

† These words are used interchangeably. St. Paul, Rom. i. 25, speaks of worshipping and serving the creature, to the passing by of the Creator, and in Gal. iv. 8, of doing service to them which by nature are no Gods—in the first case Latria is used, in the second Dulia. Again, 1 Thes. i. 9; How ye turned from idols to serve (Dulia) the living God, compared with Hebrews, ix. 14, where Christ's blood is said to purge the conscience from dead works to serve (Latria) the living God. The distinction papists make is not a Scriptural one,

‡ I must except the Virgin, for as it will hereafter be seen, some Romish theologians are of opinion that Latria is due to her.

gians, *approved by the Roman Church*, LATRIA, or *Divine worship* is due to the following creatures. *Images* of Christ; of the Trinity; of God the Father. *Relics* of the blood of Christ; of His nails; His hair; His flesh; of the true Cross; of the nails which fastened him to it; of the spear; the scourge; the reed; the sponge; of the napkin of Veronica; of the linen cloth in which our Lord was wound; of the coat without seam; of the purple robe; of the pillar to which he was bound when he was scourged; of the inscription on the Cross. *Images* of the true Cross of any material, such as wood, metal, or ivory. *The Blessed Virgin*, and her *images* and *relics*. *The Scriptures*. To all these created objects, LATRIA or *the honour due to God only*, is formally, expressly, and professedly paid in the Roman Communion.

These points shall be immediately established by quotations from your most eminent divines; and as you are for ever asserting that the decrees of the Council of Trent in regard to images have entirely prevented the possibility of idolatry, I shall only cite from writers who have lived since that Council was celebrated.

1. I shall commence with Azorius.

"The first question is, Whether the *Cross* and *Image* of Christ our Lord ought to be adored with the worship of LATRIA? There are four opinions of the doctors, but in my judgment they may be reduced to two, as I shall hereafter say.

"The first opinion denies it; so that, according to this opinion, the worship of Latria is referred, as to its term, to Christ, contained in the image only by thought or meditation; and the Image or Cross is only that, in which, or by which, we worship *Christ*, so that it may be truly said, we do not worship the Cross or the Image of Christ with Latria, but Christ himself in the Cross or Image."*

He remarks that Alexander, Durandus, Holcot, and Mirandula, are all said to have been of this opinion.

"The second opinion affirms that they, (the *Images* and *Cross*,) OUGHT TO BE WORSHIPPED WITH THE ADORATION OF LATRIA, that is, with the same worship, honour and veneration, with which Christ, whose image it is, is worshipped; for it saith, that in a Cross or image *three* things may be considered: First, the mere substance of the sign or image in its own nature and *per se*, which is matter, i. e. wood, gold, silver, or stone; and in this respect it is not capable of veneration or worship. The second is, the figure, relation, and order, by which a sign, or

* Azorii Institut. Moral. tom. i. lib. ix. c. vi.

image is referred to the original which it represents; for what represents and what is represented, are mutually related: in which way also the worship of Latria is by no means due; because this order and relation is something created, really distinct from Christ, the prototype and original. The third is, that the image actually refers to and *represents* Christ, AND IN THIS MANNER, saith Cajetan, THE WORSHIP OF LATRIA IS DUE TO IT; so that the worship is referred as well to the IMAGE which represents, as to Christ whose similitude it bears."*

This opinion, he says, "*is received by the common consent of Theologians*, as St. Thomas, Alexander de Hales, Bonaventure, Ricardus, Albertus Magnus, Paludanus, Almain, Marsilius, Major, Capreolus, and the other more recent writers."

"The third opinion is that of Gabriel Biel, who asserts that worship is due to the Cross and Image of Christ, but not that of Latria properly, but improperly and in a general signification, or by a sort of analogy and similitude."

"The fourth opinion *distinguishes* in this manner. When the image is worshipped on account of that which it represents, it is the worship of *Latria;* but when on account of itself . . . it is not the worship of Latria but Dulia."†

It may be observed here, that Latria is admitted in some sense to be due to the *Cross* or *Image* of Christ by the advocates of three out of four opinions, which, according to Azorius, exist amongst Romish theologians.

Azorius, who upholds the *second* opinion, then considers the objections which may be advanced against it from the decrees of the second Nicene Synod, and remarks that "the Synod suggests that a two-fold worship is to be paid to a Cross; of LATRIA, on account of the original which it represents, and of Dulia, on account of the sanctity as it were inherent in it . . . . On the other hand it is *the constant judgment of theologians* that the image should be honoured and worshipped with the same honour and veneration with the original; and *the Council of Trent* seems to intimate this, Sess. xxv. In decreto fidei de sacris imaginibus." So that the image of Christ is to be adored with Latria.

We have thus seen, that the *true Cross* of Christ and the *Image* of Christ are to be adored with Latria. Let us next see what is said of other matters.

Azorius enquires, "Whether, as a Cross of any material is worthy of the worship of Latria, so also the *nails*, *spear*, *scourges*, *sponge*, *crown of thorns*, made of any materials, ought to be worshipped with LATRIA. St. Thomas replies, that a Cross of any

* Azorius, ubi supra. † Ibid.

material ought to be worshipped with Latria, because not only the Cross on which Jesus Christ hung, is worthy of that worship because it *touched Christ;* but also inasmuch as it is a Cross, that is, a sign and image of Christ hanging on the Cross; but the other instruments of our Lord's Passion only deserve the worship of LATRIA, because they touched the body of Christ."*

Hence it follows that any *relics* of such instruments are to be adored with LATRIA, though images of them are not to be so.

Another question is, "Whether, if any portion of the *blood* shed in the death of Christ, which Christ did not resume when He came to life, should exist any where, it ought to be worshipped with LATRIA. From what St. Thomas has taught, it is deduced, that it *ought* to be worshipped; because, although separated from the Divine Word, it yet *touched* the body of Christ; so that if any of His *hairs* existed any where, or any little *particles of his flesh* separated by circumcision, they would deserve the worship of LATRIA."†

There are many alleged relics of our Saviour in existence, such as hairs, drops of His blood, parings of His nails, the prepuce, the napkin of St. Veronica, &c. &c.; all of which are, according to this doctrine, to be worshipped with LATRIA.

In fine, Azorius states his own belief to be, that the worship due to images is, "LATRIA, if we worship the image of Christ; Hyperdulia if it be the image of the Virgin; or Dulia if we worship the images of the Saints dwelling in heaven."‡

2. The next Theologian to whom I shall appeal is Cabrera.

In speaking of the different opinions of Roman Catholic Divines on this point, he says, that the "First is, that images are to be adored on account of the prototype; yet not with the same adoration, but with another, inferior." He cites some writers who held this opinion, and who thought that the image of Christ should not be adored with Latria, or else that Latria should be only offered to it *analogicâ.*"§

The second opinion teaches that the same adoration altogether should be exhibited to the images and the things they represent; so that the image of Christ is to be adored with the LATRIA with which Christ Himself is worshipped; that of the Virgin with Hyperdulia; and so of the rest.

This, he says, is the doctrine of St. Thomas, Cajetan, Capreolus, Paludanus, Ferrariensis, St. Antoninus, Soto, "*and almost all the ancient Theologians;*" of Alexander Alensis, Albertus Magnus, Bonaventure, Richard St. Victor, Dionysius Carthusianus, Major, Marsilius, Waldensis, Tunecremata, An-

* Azorius, ubi supra. † Ibid. ‡ Ibid. § Pet. de Cabrera, p. 639.

gestus against Luther, Clichtovæus, Turrianus, Vasquez, "and many others more recently."*

This doctrine is, according to Cabrera, proved from the *Council of Trent*, from "*the Seventh Synod*," from the Fathers, &c.; and he maintains that it is "most true, most pious, and very consonant to the decrees of faith." †

Cabrera replies to all the objections which are alleged from the Councils of Nice and Trent, and establishes the above doctrine from both of those Councils.‡ He even maintains that it is *de fide*.

"From this explanation of the Council of Nice, collected from the Fathers, it seems to follow that *it is a dogma of the faith*, and that the image of Christ, and of the Cross also, are to be adored with LATRIA; although it seems to many in this age, that it has not yet been defined by a Council, but only that images should be honoured with due veneration; but that it has not been defined what this veneration should be."§

With more particular reference to the Cross, Cabrera deduces from St. Thomas Aquinas the following conclusions.

"First—The Cross on which Christ was crucified is to be adored with LATRIA, both because it represents the form of Christ extended on it, and because it was sanctified by the contact of the members of Christ, and bathed in His blood." The proof is as follows: "The adoration of LATRIA is due to that thing in which the hope of salvation is placed, but the hope of salvation is placed in the Cross of Christ, according to that hymn of the Church, 'O Crux ave, spes unica,' &c. Therefore, &c. Secondly, because we speak to it (the Cross) and entreat it, as if it were Christ crucified Himself."‖

"Secondly—The *image* of the Cross of Christ, of any materials, is to be adored with Latria,"¶ &c.

It may be here observed, that the above argument from the *language* applied to the Cross would equally go to prove that the Virgin and Saints are adored with Latria, as I have produced in my first and fifth Letter many addresses to them, which fully equal what Aquinas cites in reference to the Cross. We may therefore claim Aquinas himself as a testimony to the idolatrous character of those addresses to the Saints.

Cabrera establishes the first of the above conclusions from Scripture and the Fathers, "whence," he says, "it is evident that the Cross on which Christ hung is to be adored with LATRIA, on account of the contact of the members of Christ; because, on this consideration alone, (setting aside its being an image)

* Pet. de Cabrera, ubi supra, p. 641. † Ibid. p. 644. ‡ Ibid. p. 646.
§ Ibid. p. 647. ‖ Ibid. ¶ Ibid.

it is a *relic* of Christ our Lord; but it is certain that relics are to be adored, as will appear in Article 6. Whence, as the adoration of Latria seems to me to have been defined as a *matter of faith*, to be due to the *images* of Christ, so also I think of His *Cross*. And a most cogent reason may also be deduced from the received custom of the Church, which addresses the Cross itself as she does Christ crucified."*

He observes that the opinion of those who deny that Latria is due to the Cross, or that honour is only due to it in remembrance of Christ, is erroneous, and ought to be rejected.

Cabrera maintains that the second conclusion, cited above, is "also to be held *as a matter of faith*,"† i. e. that a Cross of any materials is to be adored with LATRIA.

With reference to the *images* of the nails, &c., he holds, with Aquinas, that they are not to be worshipped with LATRIA. He reserves that worship for those objects themselves. "In the third degree are those things which, by contact with our Lord, partook of his holiness, and remained dignified even in the estimation of believers; as the Cross, nails, thorns, spear, &c.; and these are to be adored with LATRIA."‡

It might be naturally imagined that if the Cross was to be adored with Latria on account of its contact with Christ, other objects might be regarded as entitled to the same worship. And here of course the Blessed Virgin will at once occur to the mind. Accordingly we find that there are various theologians who are of opinion that she is entitled to Latria. Cabrera shall speak on this very important point.

After citing from Thomas Aquinas the following conclusion, "The Mother of Christ is not to be adored with Latria, but with hyperdulia," he observes that, "The first part of this conclusion is a dogma of faith, since the opposite is the heresy of the Collyridians, (as Epiphanius relates, Hær. 78, et 79), who worshipped the Blessed Virgin as God, and offered sacrifices to her . . . But whether, by reason of her *contact* with the body of Christ and the consanguinity which she had with Christ, she may be in some way adored with LATRIA, has not been defined by the Church, *but is a matter of controversy with theologians.* On the affirmative side, the first argument is, that the insignia of Christ's Passion, such as the Cross, spear, crown of thorns, &c., are adored with Latria on account of their *contact;* but the Virgin Mother of God was more closely united with Christ than the Cross, &c. Secondly, because she was the *Mother* of Christ, and therefore should be adored with the same veneration as the King Himself. Thirdly, because titles are given to the

* Pet. de Cabrera, ubi supra. p. 653. † Ibid. ‡ Ibid. p. 654.

blessed Virgin which are only due to God; therefore Latria ought to be paid her with these titles; or if it be not, the titles should not be either,"* &c.

It may here be observed that according to the generally received principle that the same honour is due to images and relics as to their originals, it follows that the images and relics of the Virgin are to be adored with Latria.

Cabrera produces the arguments of Aquinas in opposition, and thus continues. "Cajetan understands this to be the opinion of St. Thomas, not absolutely and simply, but by reason of *scandal* or *danger;* in the absence of which he admits that the blessed Virgin may be worshipped with the adoration of LATRIA in respect of her *contact* alone. *Other theologians* are of opinion that she may be adored with LATRIA, not merely on account of *contact*, but also on account of her maternity and consanguinity."†

It may be easily inferred from the following sentiments of Alphonso de Ligorio, that there must be a large number of persons in the Roman Communion who would be disposed to receive the doctrine that Latria is due to the blessed Virgin. "When an opinion honourable to the holy Virgin is discussed, if this opinion be neither repugnant to faith, nor to the decisions of the Church, and that it has some foundation, some support; to reject, to combat it, merely because the other sentiment may be also true, demonstrates very little either love or respect for the Mother of God."‡ Since then the opinion that Latria is due to the Virgin on account of her contact and consanguinity with our Lord, may be lawfully held by Romanists, it cannot be doubtful that the votaries of the Virgin must regard it as a sort of duty to adopt, or at least to favour that opinion.

Cabrera himself does not agree with this opinion, but he does not presume to censure it.

It further appears from his statement, that the name of Jesus and the *Scriptures* are, according to some theologians, to be worshipped with LATRIA.

"It is doubted with regard to this and the preceding articles, what is to be said of the worship of the name of Jesus, of the names of God, and of the Holy Scripture. *Some answer in the very same manner as regards images*, because they are signs and notes, to which therefore the *same adoration is due as to the things signified.*"§

3. Gregory de Valentia maintains the following position. "Images are to be honoured with the same honour as their pro-

* Cabrera, ubi supra, p. 665.
† Ibid. p. 655.
‡ Glories of Mary, chapter v.
§ Cabrera, *ubi supra*, p. 656.

totypes, and therefore the images of Christ's humanity are to be worshipped with LATRIA."*

"The question is, whether the wood of the Cross and other things which are, as it were, relics of Christ, as the Sudarium, particles of His blood, and such like things, which are customarily shown, ought to be honoured with LATRIA. . . . I reply, as of the images of Christ, whatever it be that is held on no light grounds to have had the habit of touching Christ, is most rightly honoured with Latria, not *per se*, but *per aliud*, as St. Thomas explains it . . . The very wood of the Cross ought to be honored with Latria. So also the linen cloth or Sudarium of Christ is to be adored with Latria, and the nails, spear, &c.—So also any relics of the blood of Christ. But as far as relates to the Cross which is customarily formed of various materials, in imitation of that Cross on which Christ hung; it is also to be adored with LATRIA."†

4. Grester, one of your most celebrated Theologians, writes thus.

"We have thus far shown that the Cross of the Lord is to be worshipped: it is now to be explained more particularly with what species of worship not only the original Cross, but its images and signs, are to be adored. . . . . We assert, in accordance with *the opinion which is more common*, and *generally received in the schools*, that the CROSS is to be worshipped with LATRIA, that is with DIVINE WORSHIP not indeed *per se*, but *per aliud;* not absolutely, but with respect and relation to its prototype. To which opinion St. Thomas subscribes, and many of those who follow his doctrine, as Cajetan, Capreolus, Gregory de Valentia, and others not a few."‡ He then proves this doctrine at great length from tradition.

Gretser affirms that the same worship is due to all the instruments of our Lord's suffering—"the nails with which Christ was fixed to the Cross; the spear which pierced His side, the sponge with which He was given to drink, the title of the Cross, the pillar to which He was bound when beaten with rods, and other instruments of the Lord's Passion consecrated by the touch of the blood of Christ."§ To all of these the same worship is due. And we learn further from this writer, that these instruments are still in existence, and are worshipped in various parts of the world. The *nails* are to be found in various places.‖

* Gregorious de Valentia, Comment. in D. Thom. tom. iv. p. 339. Ed. Lugd. 1619. † Greg. de Valent. ubi supra, p. 343.

‡ Jac. Gretserus, De Cruce, tom. i. p. 169. l. i. c. 57.

§ Grester, ubi supra c. 54. p. 161. ‖ Ibid. p. 2 8.

There are relics of the *title of the Cross* at Rome and Thoulouse.* Many *thorns* and fragments of the crown of thorns still subsist.† The *column* to which our Lord was tied is to be found in the Church of St. Praxedes at Rome, besides many fragments of the same which are shown elewhere.‡ The *reed* and *sponge* are at St. John Lateran, though part of the latter is also in France.§ The *spear* is at Paris, and in other places.|| The *napkin of Veronica*, with which our Lord dried His face, and on which its impress remained, is at Turin, together with the *linen cloth* in which He was wrapped in the tomb.¶ The *coat without seams* till exists, it seems, at Paris, Treves, and elsewhere,** not to speak of the *purple robe*,†† and may other similar relics, all of which, together with those above mentioned, are, according to the doctrine of Aquinas and the great body of the Roman Catholic theologians, to be worshipped with Latria or Divine worship.

5. Vasquez maintains at length, and with great learning, that the image must be worshipped with the *very same act of worship* as the original. "It is an exceedingly common and ancient doctrine of the divines, which I think true, that the motion of adoration towards the image, so passes into its prototype and original, that both are included under the same veneration; so that, not even in thought can the image be adored *per se* without the original, or separated from it."‡‡ He affirms that "the ancient scholastics . . . say absolutely that the images of Christ and of *the Trinity*, are to be worshipped with the adoration of LATRIA."§§

6. Jacobus de Graffiis, Penitentiary at Naples, affirmed that "We should bestow LATRIA on the image of *God* or of *Christ* or the sign of the Cross."||||

7. The same doctrine is taught by Francis de Sales. "In so far as the Cross represents Christ crucified, and has been sprinkled with His blood, it is to be adored with the same adoration as Christ Himself, that is, with LATRIA."¶¶

8. Bellarmine recognizes the doctrine of Aquinas as exist-

* Gregorius de Valentia, ubi supra p. 286, 287. † Ibid. p. 288, 289.
‡ Ibid p. 290. § Ibid. p. 290. || Ibid. p. 291, 293.
¶ Ibid. p. 295, 297. ** Ibid. p. 300. †† Ibid. p. 301.

‡‡ Vasques, De cultu Adorationis, Libri tres, l. ii. disp. viii. c. 3. p. 283. Ed Mogunt. 1594.

§§ Veteres scholastici . . . absolute dicunt imagines Christi et Trinitatis esse colendas adoratione Latriæ. Disp. ix. c. i. p. 334.

|||| Jac. de Graffiis, Decisiones Aureæ. Pars i. l. ii. c. ii. p. 115. Ed. Taurini, 1597.

¶¶ Franc. Sales. in Tract. Apologiæ de Vexillo Crucis præfixo.

ing in the Church. He states that "there are three opinions," as to the sort of worship due to images, the second of which is, "that the same honour is due to the image as to the original; and therefore that the image of Christ is to be adored with Latria."* He argues indeed that "as far as regards the manner of *speaking*, it should not be *said* (especially in Sermons to the people) that any images ought to be adored with Latria, but on the contrary that they ought not to be so adored."† But it is evident that he is only urging the necessity of *caution in the use of language*, so as to avoid giving offence. He does not attempt to show that there is any error or sin in offering relative divine worship to the images of Christ. He argues that it is unadvisable to speak of offering such honours, because the Councils and Fathers have not used such language; because it may be dangerous to the people; and because "This mode of speaking offends the ears of (some) Catholics, *and affords to heretics an occasion for blaspheming more boldly*."‡ But as for *the thing itself*, he is of opinion that "it may be admitted that images may be worshipped *improprie* or *per accidens*, with the same sort of worship as their original;"§ or, as he explains it, that the image of Christ may be adored with the worship due to Christ Himself, not *per se*, but as it *represents* and *is in the place of* its original.‖ In fine, he shows that his view is in accordance with that of Aquinas and the schoolmen generally: thus recognizing their authority, and attesting the prevalence of their doctrine in the Church of Rome.

I shall pass over various proofs of the prevalence of such views which might be deduced from the writings of Turrianus, Stapleton, Costerus, Tannerus,¶ and others of your theologians, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and proceed to testimonies of a later date.

9. Amort, in his Theology, published under the auspices of Pope Benedict XIV. in 1752, distinctly maintains this doctrine. In reply to the question: "What is sufficient and requisite in order that the worship of LATRIA (respectively at least) be exhibited to any thing," answers thus: "It is sufficient and requisite that God desired to be honoured with an excellent wor-

* Bellarminus, De Reliquiis Sanct. lib. ii. c. xx.

† Ibid. c. xxii.

‡ Ibid.

§ Cap. xxiii.

‖ Ibid.

¶ Turrianus, apud Cabrer. p. 641; Stapleton, Prompt. Cathol. part i. p. 292; Coster. Enchird. p. 438, 439; Tanner. in 2. 2. Thom. disp. 4th, 48.

ship *in that thing or image*, as the immediate instruments of our salvation and of His own glory. . . . . It is moreover requisite that the thing should have been adopted by Christ to share in His glory, and commanded to be honoured, and that thiss hould have been manifested to us by some sign either tacit or express. But this was manifested to us concerning all the parts of His body assumed to glory in the resurrection, and concerning His five wounds which He retained in glory, and concerning THE CROSS. . . . . Since therefore Christ glories in His wounds and His Cross, and Christians also glory in it, it was fitting that God should desire the OTHER INSTRUMENTS, (i. e. the nails, sponge, &c.) of our salvation and His glory, (assumed to glory) to be held by us in exceeding reverence,"* &c.

Hence it appears that the Cross and other instruments of Christ's Passion are to be adored with Latria, according to the doctrine of Aquinas. The same author allows that images of *God* and of the *Holy Trinity* may be publicly worshipped, provided that they are made in a certain manner;† and the context renders it evident that he considers Latria to be the proper worship due to such images.

10. The doctrine of Dens on this subject is of peculiar importance, as his work is an esteemed manual of the Romish priesthood in these countries at the present day, I shall therefore quote from this writer at some length.

"With what worship are the images of Christ and the Saints to be venerated?

"St. Thomas replies to the question, that images may be honored *with the same worship with which their prototypes are honored*, but only with a relative or respective worship: whence the images of Saints are worshipped with the respective worship of Dulia; those of the blessed Virgin with the relative worship of Hyperdulia; *those of* CHRIST *and of* GOD *with the respective worship of* LATRIA [Christi et Dei respectivo Latriæ cultu.] Many however maintain that this respective worship given to images ought to be less than the worship given to their prototypes: and hence they infer that the worship of Latria is due to no image. They depend on the seventh Synod, which says that Latria is not to be given to images because it befits the Divine nature only. But others explain the seventh Synod (as speaking) of *absolute* Latria, which is not due to the images of Christ, although the respective worship of Latria be due to them; and they are adored with honour less than that due to the prototype:

* Amort. Theologia. tom. xxi. p. 235, 237.
† Ibid. i. 237.

which doctrines are not repugnant to each other. However it may be, let it be enough for us against the Sectaries, that all Catholics teach and prove that images of the Saints are to be venerated.*

"With what worship are relics honored?

"In a mode and with a worship like that which the images of Christ and the Saints are worshipped (according to what was said, Num. xxvii.) and thus, *with the same worship with which the person whose relics they are*, but a relative or respective worship. . . . Objection 2. A pious son does not honour the instruments of contumely with which his father was slain: therefore a Christian ought not to worship *the Cross, or the other instruments* of the death of Christ, or of the martyrs. . . . I deny it. . . . We worship *the Cross, &c.* . . . inasmuch as they were the instruments of the victorious Passion and exaltation, which were also sanctified by *the contact* of the Body of Christ, or of the Saints.†

"Is the blessed Virgin to be honoured with the respective worship of *Latria*, on account of the contact of Christ, as THE CROSS OF CHRIST IS ADORED? . . . Thomas replies in the negative. The difference is, because the Cross is an inanimate thing, the worship of which is in itself only respective," &c.‡

11. I shall produce an example of the sort of instruction which is given to the people on such subjects at the present day. The following extracts are made from a Catechism of "Christian Doctrine," printed at Florence in 1837.

"*M.* What is adoration? [*l'adorazione.*]

"*D.* An act of religion, with which we worship the Divine Majesty, and submit ourselves to Him in acknowledgment of His supreme dominion.

"*M.* Of what kind is it?

"*D.* Of three kinds; Latria, which is paid to God; Hyperdulia, which is paid to the Virgin; Dulia, which is paid to the Saints.

"*M.* Ought we to pay any adoration at all to the images of Christ, or of the Virgin, or of the Saints?

"*D.* If we consider them only in themselves as a sacred and blessed thing, we show them that respect only which we feel towards a sacred and blessed thing; but considered as the *representative* of a Saint, we ought *to adore them with the same kind*

* Dens, Theologia, tom. v. p. 45.
† I bid. p. 47.
‡ Ibid. p. 48.

of adoration with which we adore the Saint which they represent."*

12. In fine, the Roman Pontifical fully confirms and authorizes the same doctrine. It expressly asserts that "LATRIA *is due to the Cross*,"† i. e. to an *image* of the Cross, a position which contains the doctrine of Aquinas and the schoolmen, that *the same worship is due to an image as to the original;* and from which it follows that images of the Trinity, of God, of Christ, and of the Cross, as well as relics, are to be worshipped with LATRIA.

It has now been proved that IDOLATROUS WORSHIP OF IMAGES AND RELICS, has been authorized and sanctioned by the leading Divines of the Roman Communion from the time of the Council of Trent to the present day. Here none of the subterfuges so commonly resorted to by Romanists can avail them. It is in vain that they exclaim "that they pay no divine honours to the images or relics of the *Saints.*" We reply, that *this is not our charge.* We only charge their Divines with recommending the worship of images of Christ, of God, of the Trinity, of the Cross, of the Virgin; and relics of Christ, of the true Cross, and of the instruments of the Passion. It is in vain also that they protest "that they do not offer Divine honours to images." We understand their distinctions. They do not worship images *per se*, or as they are so much wood or stone; they worship them as *representatives* of their original. They can therefore deny that they worship images, while at the same time they do in reality worship them most devotedly. It is in vain also that they assure us that they do not worship images "as Gods," or "for Gods," or "instead of God;" for we know that they do not believe that an image of God is itself God; and do not worship it as such. They worship it however as the *representative* of God; and in this view give to it the honours due to God Himself. Such are the subterfuges to which Romanists are driven in their attempt to elude the charge of idolatry.

But it may be alleged, that such doctrines are merely discussed in the theological schools, and never enter into popular instruction; that consequently there is no idolatry in fact practised amongst the people.

Now in the first place it will be observed, that I have quoted

* Firenze, nella Stamperia Brazzini, 1837.

† Pontificale Romanum Clementis VIII. p. 672. Ed. Rom. 1595; Pont. Rom. Urban. VIII. Pars iii. p. 109 Paris. 1664; Pont. Rom. p. 571. Typis Vaticanis, 1745.

a Catechism intended for *popular instruction*, and printed only five years ago, in which it is plainly inculcated that the same kind of adoration is due to an image as to its original. From which it follows, that divine honours are due to certaim images. I would next remark, that the doctrines above mentioned have never been restricted to the schools; for Bellarmine thinks it necessary to recommend that in sermons to the people it should not be said that Latria is due to images;* and on the other hand, Vasquez is of opinion that, in popular discourses, the method of the old schoolmen, who absolutely affirmed that Latria is due to them, is preferable.† Cabrera also supposes that these doctrines are known to the people.‡ There is in fact no sort of attempt to conceal them; except indeed from the opponents of Romanism.

Supposing however that they were not expressly taught to the people, the danger of idolatry would scarcely be in the slightest degree diminished. For it is undeniable that Romanists are taught to "worship" and "adore" images: the use of those words is continual. But, according to the "Declaration of the Vicars Apostolic," "the words 'adoration,' and 'worship' are *equally* referred, sometimes to God, and sometimes to creatures."§ Veron says that "*certainly* the people understand by the word 'adoration' *the absolute worship of* LATRIA;"|| and the Wallemburghs affirm that the people "*often* understand the word 'adoration' as signifying the *highest honour due only to God which we call* LATRIA."¶ Hence it follows necessarily that the perpetual inculation in the Roman Communion of the worship and adoration of images leads the people into idolatry.

The mere profession of the Christian religion is no more an infallible safeguard against idolatry than it is against heresy or any other sin. Bossuet himself admits that "there might be some reason to fear for the ignorant, that the use of images would lead them to idolatry." That man is naturally inclined to this sin is evident from the fact, that the great majority of the world has been at all times actually involved in it, and that even the *chosen people of God* under the former dispensation became, to a great extent, worshippers of false gods. Henee there can

* Bellarmin. De Reliquiis Sanct. l. iii. c. xxii.
† Vasquez, De Cultu Adorationis Libri Tres, l. ii. disp. ix. c. i. p. 374.
‡ Cabrera, in iii. S. Thomæ. ii. q. 555. Ed. 1602.
§ Declarations, &c. Sect. iv.
|| Veron, Regula Fidei, § viii.
¶ Walenbursch, Controvers. tom. ii. p. 206.
** Veron, *ubi supra.*

be no sort of assurance that the mere profession of true religion affords any security against idolatry.

But it is frequently alleged that the Council of Trent enacted certain decrees on the subject of images and relics which removed all danger of idolatrous worship. To this I have to answer first, that all the writers whom I have cited lived after the Council of Trent, and were so far from admitting that their doctrine was condemned in that Council, that they continually adduce the decrees of Trent in confirmation of their own views. Secondly, it is evident on examination, that the Council of Trent made no decision against the doctrines of Aquinas and the schoolmen on these points. Thirdly, Veron, after mentioning the different doctrines of the schoolmen as to the worship of images and relics, says, that the Council of Trent observes a prudent silence as to these opinions, " and teaches nothing else but that '*due* honour and veneration is to be rendered to them.' Wherefore none of the aforesaid (doctrines) is *de fide:* therefore let them be kept within the bounds of the schools. You are not obliged to subscribe to any of them in order to be a Catholic. Subscribe the Council of Trent only,"* &c. So that, notwithstanding the decrees of the Council of Trent, members of the Roman Communion are at perfect liberty to maintain that Divine honours are due to certain images and relics.

From what has been said it follows necessarily that YOU CANNOT WARN YOUR PEOPLE against offering relative LATRIA or *Divine honours* to the images and relics which I have mentioned, AS AGAINST A SIN. For, in the first place, the Council of Trent has not made any decision against the practice. Secondly, your most eminent theologians have generally maintained it, and have never been censured for so doing by any Popes, Councils, or Bishops. Thirdly, those theologians have maintained that their doctrine is supported by the Fathers, by theological reasons, by the general consent of theologians, by the practice of the Roman Church, and by several General Councils, including that of Trent; and according to the doctrine of probability generally received by Romanists, it is perfectly safe to receive any doctrine supported by such grave reasons. Fourthly, the doctrine of Aquinas and the schoolmen is regularly maintained in your schools at the present day. Hence it is plain that you cannot by any possibility teach your people that the above mentioned idolatrous worship of images and relics is a sin. You

* Veron, *ubi supra.*

are on the contrary obliged to admit to them that it is lawful, and that it is not idolatrous.

Hence we may turn over all your Treatises on Doctrinal and Moral Theology; all your directions to Confessors; all your Catechisms and books of devotion; and never find in any of them any *condemnation* of the practice of offering Latria to the images and relics which I have mentioned. It is true, that some of your writers *argue* against it: but none of them venture to *condemn* it; or to say that it is *sinful;* or that it is in any degree *idolatrous.* It forms no subject of confession: no penitent is ever questioned on the point: no one is ever put to penance for offering Divine honours to created objects. Idolatry is, perhaps, the most prevalent of your sins, and it is that which is the most easily tolerated. It would seem to be the object of your writers to close every avenue by which a conviction of danger on this point could be brought home to the consciences of your people. Every doubt and scruple is set at rest by the assurances of your theologians, that Idolatry consists in worshipping images as if they were "other Gods," in *opposition* to the only true God*—or in worshipping the images of *false gods* like those of the Heathen—or in imagining that the Divinity is *present* in images—or in offering *sacrifice* to images.† They are told, that there is *no danger of idolatry* amongst Christians:—"Now that Christianity has reigned amongst us for so many centuries, what danger can be seen in images, when the faithful learn from their infancy that they are forbidden 'to ask any grace from them, or to place their confidence in them,' . . . and that if they prostrate themselves, and bend their knees before them, it is only to the *originals,* i. e. to Jesus Christ and the Saints, that this suppliant posture is referred?"‡ Thus Romanists are encouraged to commit acts of the most fearful idolatry without the slightest compunction or trouble of conscience. They are satisfied that they *cannot* commit idolatry; and, therefore, indulge in it without any cheek or controul whatever.

I have now accomplished the object which was proposed in this Letter. I have shown that Idolatry is approved and authorized in the Church of Rome; that it is practised without any censure or effectual resistance; that your people are allowed to commit this most fearful of all sins without impediment or scruple. What are we to conclude from this?

First, may it not be most reasonably inferred, that if the

* Trevern, Discuss. Amicale, tom. ii. p. 336, 339. † Ibid. p. 341.
‡ Trevern, Discuss. Amicale, tom. ii. p. 352.

authorities of your Communion do not actually themselves practice Idolatry, they are surrounded by an overwhelming mass of Idolatry; that the people and their priests are to a great extent given over to that dreadful sin? Surely, nothing but the power and number of those who are inclined to Idolatry could prevent your Rulers from vindicating the rights of their Creator, if they really believed that those rights were infringed. We must therefore conclude, either that your *Rulers*, as well as your divines and people, *approve* of idolatrous worship; or else, that *through fear of man*, they connive at what they know to be most damnable sin. In either case, what are we to think of the *sanctity* of the Roman Church? What are we to think of the *safety* of its members? And what are we to think of those who forsake a Communion in which Idolatry is not practiced, to enter one in which it is approved, sanctioned, and practiced without the least check or controul?

Secondly, from what has been said, we cannot doubt the necessity of THE REFORMATION. If the only result of that movement had been to *expel* from amongst us the doctrines of Aquinas and the schoolmen on the worship of images and relics, and to enable us to oppose an effectual and open resistance to those doctrines by pronouncing them sinful and idolatrous, an *incalculable benefit* would have been obtained—a benefit which was more than sufficient to counterbalance numerous evils and disadvantages.

Thirdly, we may learn to judge more fairly of the Reformers. They were brought up in the midst of a system deeply tinged with Idolatry, both in doctrine and practice. They understood by experience, and saw in all its unveiled deformity, what we can only learn imperfectly from scarce and ancient writings, or from modern compositions, in which the utmost care is taken to conceal the real state of things. Their language and their actions, therefore, sometimes appear to us exaggerated or uncharitable, when the fault lies rather in our own ignorance or credulity. Were we possessed of their *practical knowledge*, we should perhaps exceed them ourselves in the energy of our denunciations.

Fourthly, we can sympathize with the feelings and principles of Bishop Jewell and other English Reformers, who were jealous of the use of images, and of certain vestments or ceremonies connected more or less, in their own minds, with idolatrous practices. Certainly the Cross and the images of our Lord had been worshipped with idolatrous honours; and we cannot therefore wonder at the indignation which was sometimes

expressed on matters which we, in our ignorance of the fearful abuses connected with them, may regard as innocent, lawful, or even pious and venerable.

Fifthly, if some errors or defects can be pointed out in the doctrine or discipline of societies which are separated from the Roman Communion, yet still they cannot be greater evils than the existence of IDOLATRY in that Communion. If some persons deny the necessity of Episcopacy; their error is not greater than that of maintaining that the Bishop of Rome is *de jure divino* the Head of the Church. If some sects undervalue Confirmation: Rome gives but half of the Eucharist. If the worship of others is meagre or uninteresting, Rome sanctions the adoration of creatures with Divine honours. If repentance is almost reduced to a name by some, Rome deprives the penitent of all consolation, and pursues the justified and pardoned beyond the grave with the tortures of hell. If some Churches are divided on trivial points and by carnal spirits, Rome enforces unity and silence on points where the most sacred interests of the truth and the glory of God are compromised. If there are needless disputes on words in some communities, Rome permits heresy and idolatry within her own bosom. If some have schismatically separated from the Church, Rome has wrongfully expelled many from her communion. If there be a spirit of incredulity in some; Rome encourages fabulous miracles, and impostures of every kind. If some persons seem in theory to supersede the office of the ministry, by the assertion of an unlimited right of interpreting the Bible according to the dictates of their private judgment, Rome discourages the persual of the Scriptures, and withdraws them from the Church. If the ministry in some communities is despoiled of much of its legitimate influence, Rome invests it with absolute and inquisitorial power, and teaches the people to bow before it with a superstitious and almost slavish veneration. If some persons are bostile even to the most harmless ceremonies, Rome encourages a system of display and worldly pomp in the celebration of worship. If enthusiasm and fanaticism are common in sects, Rome invests the wildest fanaticism with saintly dignity, and holds it up to the worship of the faithful. If sordid self-interest has commonly been at the foundation of sects, Rome has permitted discipline to be relaxed, and superstition and idolatry to be disseminated more and more widely for the pecuniary advantage of its priesthood, and for the promotion of its own interests. There are, in short, very few of the prevalent evils of religion beyond the Roman Communion, which may not be

contrasted with evils of as great an amount, or even still greater, within that Communion.

In conclusion, I would observe, that if any members of the Church of England are ever disturbed on finding that some others of its members have advanced unsound positions, and that such persons have not been censured as they deserve; still they should remember that we at least can openly resist and denounce false doctrines, and thus guard the faithful against their reception; while in the Church of Rome IDOLATRY exercises *unresisted* sway; and priest and people are consigned to its abominations, without a single warning voice to tell them that they are in the ways of sin and of eternal death. I do not mean to say that all members of the Church of Rome are *obliged* to commit this crime; nor do I pretend to say that all *actually do* commit it. God alone knows the extent to which it prevails; but it is certain that there is no safeguard whatever against it in the Roman Communion except the special grace of God; and we therefore fervently hope and pray that this grace may abound, to the deliverance of many souls from so great and terrible a danger.